UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,332	06/26/2003	Larry Henry Steinhorst	064731.0346	7931
5073 BAKER BOTT	7590 03/21/200 S L.L.P.	EXAMINER		
2001 ROSS AV	-	LEUNG, CHRISTINA Y		
SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/21/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/609,332	STEINHORST ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	-
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on to	ne cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>03 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATI	ON IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the samapplication, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with a for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11 periods:	1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the second seco	ne final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than \$\frac{1}{2}\$	ction, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension an under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	d the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance wi filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the AMENDMENTS	reof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 	
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form the appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a correspond 	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	g
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See a	ttached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if non-allowable claim(s). 	submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before of because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was	<u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the s REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	tatus of the claims after entry is below or attached.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does No See Continuation Sheet.	OT place the application in condition for allowance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (PTO/SB13. ☐ Other:	(08) Paper No(s)
	/Christina Y. Leung/
	Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2613

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertion on pages 12-14 of the response that "the references do not teach or suggest 'upgrading a first node in the optical communications ring by increasing a data transmission rate of the first node to an increased rate, the first node coupled to a second node' and 'the second node operable to transmit data at the data transmission rate'....Instead, Bruckman teaches a simultaneous rate increase throughout the network." Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertion that Bruckman et al. teach a "simultaneous rate increase through the network" and respectfully submits that Bruckman et al. instead disclose a system that is similar to the one recited in Applicant's claims. Examiner respectfully maintains that like Applicant's invention, the system disclosed by Bruckman et al. first upgrades one node of the network of nodes to a higher transmission rate, such as OC-192, from a lower original rate, such as OC-48. Bruckman et al., in page 5, paragraph [0075], specifically disclose physically replacing OC-48 cards of one node to OC-192 cards and therefore clearly disclose upgrading one node to the higher rate first, not a "simultaneous rate increase." The upgraded node now has a higher rate comprising M time slots, but until the other nodes are also upgraded. Bruckman et al. disclose that the data transmitted by the upgraded node occupies only the number of time slots corresponding to the old rate (i.e., N time slots). Like Applicant's invention, the system disclosed by Bruckman et al. has a node with an upgraded rate temporarily transmitting data only in selected time slots (see also Applicant's specification, page 7, lines 27-31, which similarly describes an upgraded node operable to configure a frame "so that data occupies only 48 time slots out of 192 available time slots"). In Bruckman et al.'s system and in Applicant's system, when all of the nodes have been upgraded, then all of the increased number of time slots may be occupied with data. Examiner respectfully maintains the rejections of the final Office action.